

REMARKS

Claims 70-100 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action dated March 28, 2006, claims 70, 71, 73, 85, 86, 90, and 91 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,647,989 to Hayashi et al. ("Hayashi"). Claims 70, 71, 85, 86, and 90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,106,728 to Iida et al. ("Iida"). Claims 72, 75, and 76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Iida. Claims 72, 74-78 and 92-100 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi in view of Iida.

The Examiner has cited Iida as disclosing a planarizing apparatus including a slurry manufacturing assembly used for recycling used planarizing solution. As described by the Examiner, Iida purportedly discloses a slurry manufacturing assembly including a first feed line (Fp line), a second feed line 54, a first removal unit 4, a combination feed line, and a slurry dispenser 301.

Hayashi also discloses a planarizing apparatus including a slurry manufacturing assembly for recycling used planarizing solution. As described by the Examiner, Hayashi purportedly discloses a slurry manufacturing assembly including a first feed line (line 7), a second feed line 11, a first removal unit 1, a combination feed line (exiting tank 4), and a slurry dispenser 17.

Neither Iida nor Hayashi discloses or fairly suggests a slurry manufacturing assembly including a first supply of a first solution with a plurality of first abrasive particles and a second supply of a second solution with a plurality of second abrasive particles in which both the first and second supplies have not been previously used to planarize a microelectronic substrate. Instead, Iida and Hayashi teaches away from such a system because the object of both Iida and Hayashi is to recycle used planarizing solution.

Claim 70 recites "a slurry manufacturing assembly including: a first supply of a first solution that has not been used to planarize a microelectronic substrate, the first solution having a plurality of first abrasive particles; a first feed line in fluid communication with the first supply for containing a flow of the first solution; a second supply of a second solution that has not been used to planarize a microelectronic substrate, the second solution having a plurality of

second abrasive particles; a second feed line in fluid communication with the second supply for containing a separate flow of a second solution having a plurality of second abrasive particles; a first removal unit coupled to the first feed line, the first removal unit configured to selectively remove a first type of selected abrasive particles from the first abrasive particles; and a combination feed line in fluid communication with the first removal unit to receive a filtered flow of the first solution from the first removal unit, the combination feed line further being in fluid communication with the second feed line to receive a flow of the second solution from the second feed line that is separate from the filtered flow of the first solution.”

Neither Iida nor Hayashi teaches or fairly suggests a slurry manufacturing assembly including a first supply of a first solution with a plurality of first abrasive particles and a second supply of a second solution with a plurality of second abrasive particles in which both the first and second supplies have not been previously used to planarize a microelectronic substrate and the first and solutions are mixed together. Instead, the systems disclosed in Iida and Hayashi teaches away from the subject matter of claim 70 because the object of both Iida and Hayashi is to recycle used planarizing solution. Thus, Iida and Hayashi certainly do not teach or suggest a system configured for mixing supplies of first and second solutions that have not been previously used to planarize a microelectronic substrate as required by the limitations of claim 70. Claim 90 is patentable over Iida and Hayashi for at least these reasons in addition to the other limitations recited therein.

Claims depending from claims 70 and 90 are also allowable due to depending from an allowable base claim and further in view of the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

All of the claims remaining in the application are now clearly allowable.  
Favorable consideration and a timely Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP



Marcus Simon  
Registration No. 50,258  
Telephone No. (206) 903-8787

MS:sp

Enclosures:

Postcard  
Check  
Fee Transmittal Sheet (+ copy)

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP  
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3400  
Seattle, WA 98101-4010  
(206) 903-8800 (telephone)  
(206) 903-8820 (fax)

h:\ip\clients\micron technology\100\500155.07\500155.07 032806 oa amendment.doc